

THE
POLITICKS
OF

High-Church :

OR, A
System of their Principles

ABOUT
GOVERNMENT.

Faithfully Extracted from their own Writers.

By which it plainly appears, that they are Calculated
for a Popish Prince and a *French* Government.

Recommended to the Consideration of the Electors against the
Choice of Members for next Parliament.

Let there be no other Distinction heard of among us for the future, but of *those who are for the Protestant Religion, and the present Establishment; and of those who mean a Popish Prince, and a French Government.* King William's Last Speech to both Houses of Parliament, 31 Dec. 1701.

L O N D O N,
Printed in the Year 1705.

1. Name of the person or firm to whom the bill is payable	
2. Amount in words	
3. Amount in figures	
4. Date	
5. Place	
6. Signature of the drawer	
7. Signature of the payee	
8. Stamp of the bank or other authority	
9. Remarks	



The INTRODUCTION.

THE Politicks which are the Subject of the following Sheets, having cost the Nation so much Blood and Treasure, it was thought fit to compose this System of them, that those who have a mind to it, may see them at one view, and that the Publick may know to whom they are indebted for such useful Maxims of State.

The Oxford-men may publish as many Histories of the Rebellion of 1641. as will fill their Theatre, and Preface them with all the Invectives their Malice can suggest against Moderate Church-men and Dissenters: High-Church may raise the Possie of all her Tattler Clergy when she pleases, to rail in Assize-Sermons with Sacheverel, and to libel and damn with Dodwell and Lelsly, the best of our Bishops and Clergy as well as Dissenters, as long as their Lungs and their Pens will keep pace with their Rancour. But while we have Records in the Nation, it will be found an uncontroversible Truth, that those High-Church Politicks brought K. Charles I. to his deplorable Exit, and pull'd King James II. down from his Throne.

The House of Commons in 1628, prov'd themselves to be not only good Judges, but true Prophets, when they call'd those Principles, Doctrines of Destruction; and said, That if they pass'd from the Ears of Princes to their Hearts, they would prove mortal.

No Man can deny the Truth of this, who considers, that these were the Reasons of State, as Sir Benjamin Rudyard did then well express it in Parliament, which had eat up all the Religion and Liberty of the World.

It was those unhappy Politicks that Exalted the Privilege to the Destruction of Property, that match'd our Princes with Popish Ladies, that open'd their Ears to French Councils, whilst they were deaf and shut against their own Parliaments: Those Principles put K. Charles I. upon levying Money without them, and, in a word, laid the Foundation of that unnatural War which issued in the Ruine of that otherwise Excellent Prince, and of our Noble Structure of Government.

It was the same Politicks which run the Cavaliers into all those Transports of Fury after the Restoration, which sacrific'd our Religion and Liberty to the Will of the Prince, and arm'd one Party of Protestants to destroy another, while the Papists plotted the Destruction of both. It was those Politicks which engaged us in a War with the Dutch, and advanc'd the growing Power of France: It was those Politicks which made the English Lions sculk under the Shadow of the French Lillies, which subjected the Fate of our Parliaments, and the Determination of our greatest Affairs of State, to the decision of French and Popish Ladies of Pleasure. In a word, it was those Politicks which brought a Popish Successor to the Throne, which made him trample upon our Religion and Laws, made him lodge our Bishops in the Tower, and entrust his Councils and Arms with Papists and Jesuits, which put us to the Danger and Expense of bringing in a Foreign Prince, and a Foreign Army, to deliver us from Popery and Slavery, and brought our most Excellent Sovereign that now is, and her late Sister of Glorious Memory, to this uncomfortable Choice, either to abandon their own Father, or to turn their back upon the Cause of God and their Country.

It is those cursed Politicks, that against the Church Established by Law, has set up a Jacobite Church of England, of whom we may as truly say, as our Liturgy did formerly of the Church of Rome, that their Religion is Rebellion, tho Dodwell and his High-Church say, there's no Salvation but in their Society.

It was those Politicks which made that Jacobite Church invite the French Fleet under M. Turville into our Channel.

It was those Politicks that form'd the Assassination Plots against K. William and Q. Mary, in concert with an Invasion from France, and that brought Sir J. Fenwick, Sir W. Perkins, and Sir J. Friend, with the rest of the Traitors and Assassins, to die Martyrs for a Popish Prince and a French Government, and made some of those poor deluded Souls to believe it to be the Cause of God.

This makes it evident, that it's high time for the Government to look about them, and to prevent the spreading of such dangerous Principles, which strike at her Majesty's Life and Crown, and tend to the subversion of that Noble Constitution, which has rais'd England to such a pitch of Riches and Grandeur.

The INTRODUCTION.

If our Electors consult the Security of her Majesty's Crown and Dignity, the Preservation of our Religion and Liberty, and the Continuance of our Succession in the Protestant Line, they will find that Men of those High-Church Principles are by no means fit to be chosen our Representatives: Nor can they think it proper to Vote for the same Men, to whom the High-Church Party generally give their Suffrage.

By their Politicks here exhibited to publick View, it will appear how much more dangerous it is for the Nation to have Men of their Stamp in Places of Power and Trust, than Moderate Church-men, or Occasional Conformists. It's the most uncharitable thing in the World to charge the Latter with Hypocrisie for Occasional Conformity with a Church whose Doctrine they firmly believe, and dissent from her in nothing but some Points of Government and Modes of Worship, wherein our Church-men themselves are not agreed; if at the same time we consider that one of the most violent Champions for the Occasional Bill, and one of the first that drew a Plan of it in his Pontificat & Regale, p. 179. Edit. 1692. proposes a Reconciliation with Rome, upon allowing the Pope the same Power that the Gallican Church does, p. 270. and proposes an immediate Communion betwixt the Church of England and the Church of France, which has so much Protestant Blood to answer for; yet that Author is so fond of this Communion, that in his Opinion, their Principles about Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, &c. ought to be no bar to it.

The Case being thus, we may easily judge what Service was design'd to Her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession, by the Violent Occasional Bill-men. They have got the Dissenters in the North of Ireland, who sav'd that Country to the English Crown, twice in the last Century, made incapable of any Places of Power and Trust, which is no great Incouragement for them to do the English Crown the like Service a third time: And could they have also excluded Moderate Dissenters, or Occasional Conformists, out of all Places of Power and Trust in English Corporations, they knew that High-Church would in that Case become a more equal Match for Men of Moderation, and then we may easily guess what Treatment his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other worthy Bishops, Lords and Commons, who adhere to the Interest of the Revolution, were to expect at their hands. Mr. Sacheverel has already past Sentence upon the Occasional Conformists, viz. A Gallows here, and Damnation hereafter; and we have no reason to think that his Charity is much greater for those Superiour Pastors, &c. whom he charges at the same time with inviting the Wolves into Christ's Fold to worry and devour the Sheep; for since Wolves act only a natural part when they destroy the Flock, the Shepherds who unnaturally betray them, must certainly deserve a higher Gallows, and a hotter Hell than Mr. Sacheverel's Beasts of Prey. See his Assize-Sermon, p. 32, 33.

It may be objected against this System of High-Church Politicks, that High-Church is now become Patriots for the Peoples Liberty, and that Archbishop Usher, Dr. Barrow, and some other moderate Men, are here listed under the Banner of High-Church. To the 1st I answer, that till High-Church renounce the Principles here charged upon them, and which they are known to have formerly own'd, we are oblig'd to think, that with the Author of the Exorbitant Grants, they are only for restraining such Princes as come in upon the Revolution bottom; but for those that shall have the good fortune to come in upon the High-Church-Foundation of Indefeasible Right, they must be restor'd to their full Prerogative.

To the Latter, I reply, that I am far from any design to derogate from the known Merit of Archbishop Usher, or any other Great Men that happen here to be mentioned; but since they were carried away in some of those Points by the Current of the Times, it would have been very unfair in me not to have mentioned them; and since our Saviour has taught us to call no Man Master in matters of Religion, of which the Liberty of Mankind from Tyranny in Church and State is so great a part, and such a necessary Fence, it's every Mans concern to believe and practise according to his own Conscience, enlightened by the unerring Word, and not to pin his Faith upon the Sleeve of Persons or Parties.

Having thus given a view of the Politicks of High Church, I design to do the like as to their Religion in a separate piece.

THE

T H E

Politicks of High-Church, &c.

C A P. I.

Concerning Parliaments.

I Principle. **T**Heir Origine is from our first Kings, who summoned whom they would, and may do so still.

Parliaments are only Royal Abatements of Power, and Gracious Indulgences, and Condescensions of our Kings (for the Benefit and Security of the Subject) who were pleased to condescend to call some Persons of each of the three Estates, it being left to their discretion, whom to summon and whom not; so that Parliaments ow'd their Being to our first Monarchs. Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha*, p. 116. & Dr. Johnston's *Excellency of Monarchical Government*, *Introduet.* & fol. 127, 128.

When the King is pleased to call a Parliament, it is his due Right by his Letter to ordain such Commissioners for Shires, and such Commissioners for Burroughs, as he shall think fit to name. Wemius de primatu Principis, p. 17. *

Queries upon this Principle.

Q. 1. How our High-Churchmen would have lik'd the Practice of this Doctrine by King William and Queen Anne, and if they would not, as it's plain from the great bustle they have made to regulate Elections, since the Revolution, and to keep out of the House those who depend upon the Court.

Q. 2. Why Moderate Churchmen and Dissenters should have lik'd it in the Reigns of the 2 James's and 2 Charles's: And,

Q. 3.

* This Gentleman was made a Judge in Scotland by Arch-Bishop Laud's Interest.

Q. 3. Whether this Doctrine would not have destroyed the Church of England, the Protestant Religion, and English Constitution at once, had King James dar'd to put it in practice, and have call'd a House of Commons, the Majority of which, at least, should have been Papists.

Q. 4. Whether if King William, according to this Doctrine, had call'd a House of Commons, the Majority of whom should have been Presbyterians, he might not have turn'd the Test Act upon the Church, and have thrown out Bishops, Common Prayer and Ceremonies.

If it be objected, that this Power belongs only to a King by Succession, but not to a King by Election, as the Author of King William's Exorbitant Grants distinguishes. The Answer is ready, that then King James, who was a King by Succession, might easily have introduced Popery, had he been endowed with such a Power.

Q. 5. Since none then but High Church and Papists ever broach'd such Doctrine, Whether the Moderate Church and Dissenters, who abhor this Doctrine, be not truer Friends than they are, to the Government and Religion by Law established.

II Principle. *The Sovereign is not obliged to call any Parliament, and may make and annul Laws without them, for the Legislative Power is in him alone.*

The King is above the Law by his *Absolute Power*, and tho for the better and more equal Course in making Laws, he do admit the three Estates, that is, the Lords Spiritual, Lords Temporal, and Commons, unto Council, yet this in divers learned Mens Opinion, is not of Constraint, but of his own Benignity, or by Reason of his Oath, at the time of his Coronation. Dr. Cowel's Interpreter. Tit. King.

III. *Laws published by the King alone, without consent of Parliament, are binding, and the People may be compelled to obey them.* Heylin's Antidote, p. 66.

IV. *The Parliament may be us'd or not us'd, as the King pleases, in making or annulling his Laws.* Wemius de primatu Principis, p. 17, & 38.

The principal Point of Sovereign Majesty, and Absolute Power, consists principally in giving Laws unto the Subjects, without their Consent. Sir R. Filmer's Power of Kings, and in particular of the Kings of England, fol. 3.

V. *The King without a Parliament may make Constitutions for the Government of the Clergy.* Noy's Reports, fol. 100, 101. Bishop Hall's Speech in the House of Lords, 1640.

Q. 1. If this Doctrine be true, how King *James II's* Proclamation of Indulgence came to be a Crime, and the opposition made to it by the Bishops, such a mighty piece of Merit.

Q. 2. If it be false, why should it not be declared so by Church and State, and not left as a handle for any future Prince to disturb us in the free Exercise of our Religion, according to the Established Laws of the Land.

It's an Eternal Law, *That the Legislative Power wholly and solely hath its Residence where the Scepter is*: Like that of the *Medes and Persians*, never to admit a Repeal. *Whitfield*, Rector of *Bugbrook*, his Sermon before the Lord Mayor, *July 30, 1682.* p. 19, 20.

The sole Legislative Power is lodg'd in the King. Bishop of *Chester's* Sermon at *Rippon*, p. 24.

The King alone is our *Legislator*, and the Power which makes Bills and Petitions, Laws, is solely and formally in the King: *Dr. Hicks's Jovian*, ch. 10. p. 201, 202. *Harmony of Divinity*, p. 48. *Watson's Discourse of Monarchy*, p. 177.

Q. 1. If this Doctrine be true, whether our Parliament be not guilty of Treason and Rebellion, when they join their Authority and Consent with that of the Prince, in making Laws: And if it be not true,

Q. 2. Why those Books are not censur'd by our Universities, and ordered by the Government to be burnt by the hand of the Common Hangman, and the Asserters of such Doctrine punish'd as Enemies to the English Constitution.

Q. 3. Whether this Doctrine does not justify all the Arbitrary Proceedings in the late King *James's* time, and arraign his Parliament for controlling him in employing Popish Officers in the Army and State, and putting Papists in Possession of Colleges, &c. And if so,

Q. 4. Why our Parliament don't take care to hinder the Propagation of those Principles; since if the Legislature be in the Prince alone, any of them that have a mind to it, may establish Popery and Tyranny by their own Edict when they please.

Concerning the House of Commons.

VI. **B**Efore the 49th of *Hen. III.* the Commons of England, as now represented, were none of the Estates of Parliament, but mentioned in Parliament betwixt 49 *Hen. 3.* and the 18th of *Ed. 1.* *Dr. Brady's Introduction to History*, p. 149. and in the Epistle to the Reader.

Q. 1. If this does not derogate from the Honour and Authority of the House of Commons, and make them look like an unnatural Wen or Excrescence upon the face of our Government.

Q. 2. Why the High-Church Members who seem to have stood up so much of late for the Privileges of that House, did not censure this Book, and put a Mark of Respect upon Mr. Tyrrel, for unanswerably proving the contrary, in the Introductions to Vol. II and III. of his History.

VII Principle. *The necessity of calling Parliaments, is derogatory to the Honour and Prosperity of the King, and unsafe for him.*

There's nothing more derogatory to the Honour and Prosperity of a King of England, than to be cast on the Necessity of calling Parliaments, which render them obnoxious to the Power and Pride of each popular Spirit, and make them less in Reputation both at home and abroad. *Heylin's Life of Laud*, p. 117.

Nothing more unsafe for a King of England, than to cast himself upon the necessity of calling Parliaments, and depending on the Purse of the Subjects, *ibid.* 129.

VIII Principle. *Parliaments don't suit the urgent Necessities of Princes, but rather hinder their just Designs, and are not necessary for raising Money, but Kings may raise it without their Consent, and it is damnable in the Subjects to refuse it.*

The King is not bound to observe the Laws of the Realm concerning the Subjects Rights and Liberties, but that his Royal Will and Command in imposing Loans and Taxes without Common Consent in Parliament, doth oblige the Subjects Conscience on pain of Eternal Damnation. *Dr. Manwaring's Sermon before the King at Whitehall, in 1627. Watson's Discourse of Monarchy*, p. 87.

The Authority of Parliament is not necessary for the raising of Aids and Subsidies. The slow Proceedings of such Great Assemblies, are not fitted for the Supply of the States urgent Necessities, but would rather produce sundry Impediments to the just Designs of Princes. *Dr. Manwaring, ut supra. Wernius de primatu Regis*, p. 19.

Doubtless the Kingdom had been taxed by our Kings, and their Privy Council only, before the Granting of Magna Charta by King John. *Dr. Brady's Introduction to History*, p. 79.

Tho such Assemblies as are the Highest and Greatest Representations of a Kingdom be most Sacred and Honourable, and necessary also for those

those Ends to which they were at first instituted, yet know we must, that ordained they were not to this End, to contribute any Right to Kings, whereby to challenge Tributary Aids and Subsidiary Helps, but for the more equal imposing and more easie exacting of that which unto Kings doth appertain, by Natural and Original Law and Justice, as their proper Inheritance annexed to their Imperial Crowns.

If Men would consider the Importunities that often may be the urgent and pressing Necessities of State, that cannot stay without certain and apparent Danger, for the Motion and Revolution of so great and vast a Body as such Assemblies are, nor yet abide those long and pausing Deliberations when they are assembled, nor stand upon the censuring those jealous and over-wary Cautions and Objections made by some, who, (wedded over-much to the Love of Epidemical and Popular Errors) are bent to cross the just and lawful Designs of their Wise and Gracious Sovereigns, under the plausible Shews of singular Liberty and Freedom, which, if their Consciences might speak, would appear nothing more than the satisfying either of private Humours, Passions, or Purposes. Dr. Manwaring's Sermon before the King at Oatlands, July 4, 1627. and at Alderton July 29, 1627. Sermon 1st. p. 267. publish'd by His Majesty's Order under the Title of Religion and Allegiance.

The Addressers from Durham, March 20, 1681. offer'd Money to the King without Consent of Parliament, to secure the Throne to a Popish Successor: The Middle Templers in their Address inserted in the Gazette Feb. 19, 1684. say, the King had a Right to take the Customs that were expir'd, without Consent of Parliament.

Q. 1. Whether the High-Churchmen, who broach'd these Principles, or the moderate Churchmen and Puritans, who oppos'd them, were the Traitors or Rebels to the English Government?

Q. 2. Whether Arch-bishop Laud and his Chaplains, Manwaring and Sibthorp, who Preached those Doctrines, were not Apostles of Slavery, and Judas's to the Liberties and Properties of Englishmen?

Q. 3. Whether the High-Church Party, who instill'd such Principles into King Charles I. and put him upon acting accordingly, or those who advis'd the contrary, and oppos'd those illegal Measures, were the Causers of that Prince's Ruin?

Q. 4. How the High-Church Party would have lik'd to have had King William and Queen Anne demand such Sums of Money of them by way of Loan, Tax, or otherwise, as they had pleased, without Consent of Parliament, and as it is evident from the Opposition they have made to the Court since the Revolution, they would not have lik'd it.

B

Q. 5. Why

Q. 5. Why they condemn those in *Charles I.* Time, who oppos'd that way of raising Money? And,

Q. 6. Whether if the Court had been possess'd of that Power in King *James II.* Time, we had not been as much under Popery and Arbitrary Power e're this time as the Subjects of *France*? And,

Q. 7. Whether our Deliverance from Popery and Arbitrary Power, be not owing then to the Moderate Church and Dissenters, who never would allow that Power to the Court?

Q. 8. If the Commons had insisted upon tacking the Occasional Bill, and by that means had hinder'd the passing of the Money Bill, if according to this Doctrine Her Majesty might not have demanded Loan Money by Her own Authority, and how High-Church would have lik'd that?

C H A P. II.

Concerning the DISPENSING POWER, and the Princes being THE SOLE INTERPRETER OF THE LAW, and having Power TO DISANNULL IT.

I. THE King may make use of Arbitrary Power, is the only Interpreter of the Law, and may change it as occasion requires.

The King is Lord of the Laws, and not obliged to an unseasonable and superstitious Reverence of the Laws, but may for a while lay aside all strict observance of them, and make use of an Arbitrary Right. He himself is instead of the whole Law, yea, he is the Law it self, and the only Interpreter thereof. Bishop *Sanderfon's* Cases of Conscience, Sect. 9. Sect. 18. Sir *Thomas Ridley's* View of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Law. Edit. 3. P. 4. C. 1. Sect. 1.

The Sovereign Prince should have the Laws in his Power, to change and amend them as occasion shall require. Sir *R. Filmer's* Power of Kings, f. 5.

II. The King is not bound to observe the Law, but at his good Will, and notwithstanding his Oath may disannull it, or suspend it, for Causes known only to himself.

General Laws made in Parliament may, upon known Respects to the King, by his Authority be mitigated, or suspended, upon Causes only known to him. And tho a King frame all his Actions according to the Laws, yet

yet he is not bound thereto, but at his good Will, and for good Example, or so far forth, as the general Law of the Safety of the Commonwealth doth naturally bind him. *Filmer's Patriarchs.* 2d Edit. p. 94.

Notwithstanding all Oaths, the Prince may derogate from the Laws, or frustrate or disannull the same, the Reason and Equity of them ceasing. *Filmer's Power of Kings*, printed in 1680. p. 2.

III. The King may generally suspend the Execution of Laws, and reward those who break the Law out of pure Loyalty to uphold the Crown on the right Head.

The Supreme Governour should not himself only be exempted from Subjection to the Law, but also be so far Lord over them, that where he sees Cause, he may abate, or totally remit the Penalty incurr'd by the breach of them, dispense with others for the not observing of them at all, and generally suspend the Execution of them. *Archbishop Usher's Power of Princes*, Epist. Dedicatory to K. Charles 2.

The Statute Laws are made to ease the King of his Labour, not to deprive him of his Power, and he may make a Grant with a Non obstante to them. In all Governments there must be a Power paramount to the Written Law, and we have good reason to bless God, that this is lodg'd but in one, and in him whom he has set over us to be his Vicegerent, by whose Authority they who break the Letter of the Law in pure Zeal and Loyalty to serve the ends of Government, and to uphold the Crown on the right Head, that does and ought to wear it, may be reliev'd and pardon'd, and rewarded too. *Bishop of Chester's Sermon in the Collegiate Church of Rippon*, 6 Feb. 168½.

IV. The King's Power is not limited, therefore his Will declar'd by Proclamation, &c. for abrogating or dispensing with Laws, ought to be obeyed.

It is indeed a proper Indowment of an Absolute Sovereignty, immediately and immutably constituted by God, with no Terms or Rules limiting it, that its Will declared by way of Precept or Proclamation, concerning the Sanction of Laws, the Abrogation of them, or the Dispensation with them, should be observ'd. *Dr. Barrow of the Pope's Supremacy.*

The Sovereign Power made the Laws, and can repeal them, and dispense with them, and make new Laws; and Sovereign Power is inseparable from the Person of a Sovereign Prince. *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Resistance*, p. 200.

The Resolves of the Judges in K. James II's time.

I. The Kings of *England* are Sovereign Princes.

II. The Laws of *England* are the King's Laws.

III. Therefore it is an Incident inseparable Prerogative in the Kings of *England*, as in all other Sovereign Princes, to dispense with Penal Laws, in particular Cases, and upon particular necessary Reasons.

IV. That of these Reasons, and these Necessities, the King himself is the sole Judge.

V. That it is not a Trust intrusted in, or granted to the King by the People, but is the Ancient Remain of the Sovereign Power and Prerogative of the Kings of *England*, which never yet was taken from them, or can be.

Q. 1. How the High-Church would have lik'd King *William* or Queen *Anne's* laying aside, or annulling the Test-Act, and imploying Protestant Dissenters in Places of Power and Trust, by their own single Authority; and since it's plain by the Noise they have made about the Occasional Bill, that they would not have lik'd it.

Q. 2. Whether they think that it's only those of the Church of *England*, whom the Prince is to govern according to Law, and that for others they may govern them in an Arbitrary manner, and at pleasure; or if they don't think so?

Q. 3. Why they don't renounce this Principle, and own themselves to have been in an Error.

Q. 4. Whether these Principles don't tend to make Parliaments and Laws of no use, and to introduce a French and Turkish Government: And since it's evident they do.

Q. 5. Whether our Kings might not, according to those Maxims, have not only discontinued Parliaments for 12 or 14 Years, as King *Charles I.* did, by the Advice and Concurrence of High Church, but have discharged them for ever; and instead of governing by Law, have rul'd us by Proclamations, and annulled our Laws by virtue of their Absolute Power and uncontrolable Authority, as the late King *James* began

began to do in *Scotland*, and bid fair towards it also by his Proclamation of Indulgence, and High-Commission Court in *England*.

Q. 6. Whether the Third Principle, *That the King may reward those that break the Law, to uphold the Crown on the right Head*, be not a good Incouragement for High-Church to break through, and act against the Law of the *Hanover-Succeſſion*, in favour of the *St. Germans Pretender*. And,

Q. 7. Since it's plain, that the above-mentioned Principles make both our Religion and Liberty precarious, and to depend upon the Will of the Prince, whether High-Church or the Low-Church, and Protestant Dissenters, be the best Christians, and Englishmen?

C H A P. III.

Concerning THE ABSOLUTE POWER OF THE PRINCE, NON-RESISTANCE AND PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

I. **T**HE most illegal Acts and Oppressions of Princes to maintain their own State and Grandure, have the Authority of Sovereign Power, and are not to be resisted, being above Laws, and not bound by them.

Neither the Laws of God nor Man allows any Subject the benefit of forceable Defence against the illegal Violence of his Sovereign, but by the Laws Imperial he ought to die rather than resist.

Kings are invested with that Sovereign Power that must not be resisted, tho they oppress their Subjects to maintain their own State, and the Grandeur and Magnificence of their Kingdom. Jovian, Edit. 1. p. 207. Sherlock of Resistance, p. 13.

Q. 1. If this Doctrine be not very well adapted to prepare us for a French Government, when the *St. Germans Pretender* comes over?

Q. 2. If this Doctrine will not defend his oppressing the People by Arbitrary Taxes, to make *Whitehall* and *St. James's* as Sumptuous as *Versailles* and *Marli*, and to maintain Standing Armies, *a la mode de France* to dragoon us out of our Religion and Liberty?

II. It becomes no Man who can think three Consequences off, to talk of the Authority of Laws, in derogation of the Authority of Sovereign Power, which is the Prince——and his most illegal Acts have the Authority of a Sovereign.

Sovereign Power. Sherlock's Case of Resistance, p. 113, 199.

III. The King is *not bound to observe the Laws of the Realm concerning the Subjects Rights, &c.* Dr. Manwaring's Sermon before the King at Whitehall in 1627.

Q. If the People of England be not highly obliged to this High-Church Doctrine?

IV. The ~~Laws~~, Ordinances, Letters Patents, Privileges and Grants of Princes, *have no force but during their Life, if they be not ratify'd by the express Consent, or at least by Sufferance of the Prince following, who had knowledge thereof;* and if the Sovereign Prince be exempted from the Laws of his Predecessors, *much less shall he be bound unto the Laws he makes himself, &c.* Filmer's Power of Kings, Fol. 1. &c.

Q. 1. If this be not an excellent Salvo to absolve the Conscience of High-Church from Oaths of Abjuration, or from Obedience to the Laws for settling the Protestant Succession after the Queen's Death?

Q. 2. Whether this does not at once absolve *Young Perkin* from all Guilt, tho he disannull all the Laws made by former Princes for the Security of our Religion and Liberty?

Q. 3. Whether Colonel *Sidney* did not deservedly lose his Head for writing against such an honest Author as *Filmer*?

Q. 4. Whether the Doctrines of High-Church Laity or Clergy be most obliging?

V. That by Higher Powers in Scripture *is meant the Person of the Prince, and not Laws and Constitutions.*

By the Higher Powers 'tis evident we are to understand the Persons of Sovereign Princes and Governors, *and not the Laws and Constitutions,* as some of our Republican Drs. pretend. Dr. Scot's Sermon upon Rom.

13. 1. p. 2.

Εξουια in the New Testament always signifies the *Authority of a Person,* not of a Law. *Sherl. Case of Resistance*, p. 113, 199.

Admitting this to be true, yet

Q. 1. Whether those Powers, to which Obedience is enjoind in Scripture, be not only Powers governing according to the Law of God, that is to say, according to Revelation and Reason? If it be denied,

Q. 2. Whether this be not to make God the Author of all the Tyranny

ranny and Oppression that Nero and such other Monsters of Men ever did or can commit when advanc'd to a Throne?

Q. 3. Whether this be not to give the Apostle the Lie, who tells us, *Rom. 13. 3.* that Rulers [or the Powers which in the first Verse he says are ordain'd. of God] are not a Terror to the good Works, but to the evil?

Q. 4. Whether Kings, as Supreme, and other Governors, be not called the *Ordinance, Creature, or Constitution of Man?* 1 Pet. 2. 14, 15. And if so,

Q. 5. Whether the Apostle was not a Republican Doctor in the Sense of High-Church? And,

Q. 6. Seeing in both those places we are positively taught that *Rulers, Powers, and Governors, were sent by God for the Punishment of Evil doers, and the Praise of them that do well, and that Powers are the Ministers of God to us for Good, whether Tyrants that do all they can to ruin Peoples Lives and Estates, by Murders, unjust War, and Oppression, and their Souls by Idolatry, or other wicked Courses, can be the Ministers of God to us for our Good.*

Q. 7. Whether *Rom. 14. 3.* Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power, *ἐξουσίαν*, do that which is good, and thou shalt have Praise of the *Same.* *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* don't relate to Power, Government or Constitution in the Abstract, according to the Grammatical Construction of the Words; and whether *ὅτι ὁ δούλος ἐστὶν* in the 4th Verse, might not be as justly translated for it is the Servant, as for he is the Servant of God to thee for Good.

VI. That the Prince has no Sharers in Sovereignty or Power co-ordinate with him, and his Prerogative cannot be restrain'd by Act of Parliament.

The Prince has no Sharers nor Copartners in the Sovereignty, none co-ordinate with him in Government, no Equal or Superior but only God, to whom alone he is subject. *Jovian, Cap. 10.*

A Sovereign is in Dignity and Authority Superior to any Number of Subjects, however conjoined or congregated, as a Head is above all the Members, however compacted; he is not Supreme who is any wise Subject, or inferior to a Senate, or any Assembly in his Territory. Dr. Barrow of the Pope's Supremacy, p. 396.

It is held by great Lawyers, That a Prerogative in point of Government can't be restrain'd or bound by Act of Parliament, but it is as unalterable as the Laws of the Medes and Persians. *Chamberlain's Present State of England.* Edit. 16. p. 86, 87.

The King, being God's Minister, is upon that account as much greater than all as God is. Dr. Sherlock's Case of Resistance, p. 104.

Q. 1. If making of Laws be not an Act of Sovereign Power? And if it be so,

Q. 2. Whether, according to the *English* Constitution, the Two Houses of Parliament are not in that respect Sharers in the Sovereignty with our Princes, and by consequence in some sort co-ordinate with them?

Q. 3. If the Prerogative can't be restrain'd by Act of Parliament, how came it that our *Saxon* Kings, as we are told in the *Mirror*, Cap. 1. Sect. 2. swore in the last Clause of their Coronation Oath, that they should be obedient to suffer the Law as much as others of their People; and how came St. *Edw.* in the 17th Article of his Laws to agree, That if the Prince did not perform his Duty there set down at large, he should not so much as retain the Name of King?

Q. 2. If the Prerogative can't be restrain'd, why the Statute of Provisors of the 25th of *Edw.* III. is not struck out of our Statute-Books, since it tells us, That the King is bound by his Oath, with the Accord of his People in Parliament, to remedy and remove the Mischiefs and Dangers there complained of. And in the *Modus tenendi Parliamenti* it is asserted, That the King cannot without Perjury suffer the Parliament to break up while any Petition before them is indiscuss'd, or has not a determinate Answer.

Q. 3. If *Magna Charta*, so often renew'd by our Princes, be not a restraint upon their Prerogative, and whether the compulsory Clause in King *John's* Charter, appointing 25 of the Nobles, as *Matt. Paris* tells us, to see the Charter executed, and to compel the King to it, by seising his Castles, and by any other Methods which they could, be not a Restraint upon the Prerogative?

Q. 4. Whether the Lord Chancellor *Fortescue* in his Book *de Laudibus Legum Angliæ*, wrote on purpose to inform the Prince of *Wales*, did not tell that Prince, Cap. 53. Fol. 129. that the Laws of this Realm restrain'd the King so as he could not Tyrannize?

Q. 5.

Q. 5. Whether we are to believe these Doctors of Slavery or the Statute Book, since we find in the 7th of *Edward II. Cap. 1.* and other Statutes upon the Head of Prerogative, that the Prerogative of the Crown, and the Liberty of the Subject, are both deriv'd from the Law, and that many Branches of the Prerogative are ascertain'd in these Statutes?

Q. 6. If those Principles be not inconsistent with our present Constitution, as founded upon the Claim of Right, and other Acts declaratory of the Liberty of the Subject? And if so,

Q. 7. Whether High Church be not dangerous Enemies to our Religion and Liberty?

VII. *That the King of England is no more limited in the exercise of his Power, Than were the Kings of the Jews, or the Christian Emperors in the Primitive Church, and that they who deny the latter are, ipso facto, Excommunicated, and that that Power was as absolute as the most absolute Monarch in the World can Challenge.*

In the Synod begun at London in 1603. *Canon 2.* Ratified by Virtue of the Prerogative Royal, and Supreme Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical, It is asserted *That the King of England has the same Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical, that the Godly Kings had among the Jews and the Christian Emperors of the Primitive Church.* And *Canon 139.* they assert it as the Doctrine of the Church of England, That the Kings of England are no more Limited in the Exercise of their Imperial Power than were the Christian Emperors of the Primitive Church; and whoever says they are, and thereby Impeaches any part of the Royal Supremacy, *Let him, say they, in Canon 2d, be Excommunicated, ipso facto, and not restored but only by the Archbishop after his Repentance and publick Revocation of such their Wicked Errors.*

Q. 1. If those Canons don't make a surrender of our Religion to the Court, and by Consequence subject the Conscience of the Nation to the Humour of the Prince?

Q. 2. If they don't leave our Religion at a very great uncertainty, since it is a matter of Controversy among the Learned, what Power the Godly Kings among the Jews had in matters of Religion, and whether all of 'em had the same Power? For some were Prophets themselves, and others acted by the Immediate direction of Prophets; and its a question whether the latter ought to have acted in matters of Religion without that direction, any otherwise than as they were warranted

ranted by Express Law, which a Wicked King might have done as well as one that was Godly?

Q. 3. If we be not at as great an uncertainty as to the Power exercis'd by Christian Emperors of the Primitive Church, since we have no perfect History of those times; and by such as we have, the practices of those Christian Emperors appear to differ very much from one another?

Q. 4. If the *ipso facto* Excommunications, without hearing what the Person has to say for himself, be not a Tyranical Invasion upon our Liberty as Christians and English Men?

Q. 5. Whether those Canon makers would allow so much power in Ecclesiastical matters to a Prince that may be a Papist, Presbyterian, or Moderate Church-man? And if they would,

Q. 6. Why their Successors and Disciples, the Modern High Flyers, are so very uneasy at Her Majesty's repeated Commands for Moderation and Union among all Her Protestant Subjects?

VIII. There is nothing more evident, than that God from the very beginning set up a Supreme and Sovereign power in the Jewish Nation, and that in Civil or Temporal Matters, as may be seen, *Dent. 17. 8.* This was at first in *Moses*, and after his death, secur'd to the High Priest or Judges; and what that Authority was appears *V. 12.* *The Man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the Priest or to the Judge, even that Man shall die. This is as absolute Monarchy as the most absolute Monarch in the World can challenge. Sherlock's Case of Resistance, p. 6. 8, 10.*

The Kings of England are more Absolute Monarchs than either of their Neighbours of France and Spain. Heylin's *Stumbling Block of Disobedience and Rebellion*, Cap. 6. Sect. 7. p. 2.

Q. 1. If this was not sound Divinity to ascribe that same Authority to the Commands of every Monarch, that God assum'd only to his own Commands and Laws, according to which the Priest and the Judge were to determine the matter in difference? as appears, *v. 11.*

Q. 2. Where would our Religion and Liberties have been, and what must have become of the Seven Bishops and the Clergy who refus'd to read King James's Declaration of *Indulgence*, had that Prince cut off all those who refus'd to hearken to his Priests and Judges?

Q. 3. Since then Great Clergymen have so frequently shew'd themselves to be Bunglers in Divinity and Interpreting Scripture, which is their own Faculty, whether they be proper Judges of the English Constitution

stitution, or ought to be suffer'd to make the Jewish or any other Foreign Government a Rule for ours?

Q. 4. VVhether *Heylin* shewed himself a good Historian, Lawyer, Divine or Christian, in asserting that our Kings are more Absolute than those of *France* or *Spain*?

IX. *That its Damnable to Disobey or Question the Commands of the Prince if not contrary to the Law of God, tho' contrary to the Laws of the Land.*

If any King Command that which stands not in any opposition to the Original Laws of God, Nature, Nations and the Gospel (tho' it be not correspondent in every Circumstance to Laws National and Municipal) No Subject may, without hazard of his own damnation, in Rebelling against God, Question or Disobey the VVill and Pleasure of his Sovereign. Dr. *Manwayring's* Sermon before the King at *Oatlands*, July. 9. 1627. p. 19.

All the significations of a Royal pleasure are, and ought to be to all Loyal Subjects, in the Nature and Force of a Command, *ibid.* P. 17.

Q. 1. If this Doctrine be true, VVhether High Church be not in hazard of Damnation, that would needs Tack the Occasional Bill to a Money Bill, tho' Her Majesty had so frequently enjoyn'd Moderation?

Q. 2. Since by their practice of Questioning and Disobeying Her Majesty's Pleasure, it is evident that they don't believe it; Whether they be not like the Scribes and Pharisees rebuked by our Saviour, that would bind heavy Burdens upon other Mens shoulders, which they will not so much as touch themselves with one of their little fingers?

If Princes Command any thing which Subjects may not perform, because it is against the Laws of God, or of Nature, or Impossible, yet Subjects are bound to undergo the Punishment either without Resistance, or Rail-ing and Reviling, and so to yield a Passive Obedience, where they cannot exhibit an Active one. I know no other Case but one of these three, wherein a Subject may excuse himself with Passive Obedience; but in all other he is bound to Active Obedience. Dr. *Sibthorp's* Sermon at *Northampton* concerning the Loan, Feb. 22. 1626.

X. King's are above all, Inferiour to none, to no Man, to no multitude of Men; to no Angel, to no Order of Angels—No Power in the VVorld, or in the Hierarchy of the Church, can lay restraint upon these Supremes. Dr. *Manwayring's* first Sermon Publish'd by the King's Aauthority, p. 8. 9.

Q. How some who are High Church now, practic'd this Doctrine when they appear'd in Jack Boots against the late King James, and took for their Motto, *Nolumus Angliæ Leges Mutari.*

XI. The Power of Princes is both Natural and Divine, not from any Consent or Allowance of Men, not in any Municipal Law, or Local Custome, not in any Law National, nor yet in the Law of Nations, *ibid.* p. 13.

Q. 1. Whether the Commons in 1627, had not reason to charge the Author of such Doctrine, with a design to alter the Frame of our Government, according to King James I. Speech to the Parliament, *into Tyranny accompanied with Perjury?*

Q. 2. Whether they did not justly compare him to *Faux* and his Fellows, who sought to Blow up Parliaments and Parliamentary Powers?

Q. 3. Whether Mr. *Rouse*, who brought in the Charge, did not Prophetically intitle it a Doctrine of Destruction, and Mischievous to Princes? *Rushw. Col. Vol. 1. p. 593 Edit. 1659.*

Q. 4. Whether the High-flyers by inculcating those Doctrines into the Ears of King Charles I. did not mischievously contribute to the ruine of that otherwise most Excellent Prince?

Q. 5. Why their Guilt should not be insisted upon on the 30th of January, as well as the Guilt of those that did actually Murder him?

XII. Christ paid Tribute, not expecting a Parliament at *Rome* or *Judea* to be first assembled. *Manwaring's 2d Serm. p. 37.*

St. Peter and St. Paul Preach Obedience to Sovereign Powers—— but have no mention, nor so much as any touch of any Limitation, Caution, Protestation or pragmatistical Sanction, to barr Kings of the Obedience which by Natural Right to them doth appertain in any Case whatsoever; but only where their Commands stand in a cleer and direct opposition to the Law of God. *Ibid. p. 41.*

Dr. *Harsenet* Bp. of *Chichester*, in a Sermon at *Whitehall* upon these words, *Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesars*, said, that *Goods and Money are Caesars*, and therefore they were not to be denied unto him.

Q. 1. How the High flyers, Clergymen or others, would like it to have Her Majesty make so bold with their Pockets?

Q. 2. How do they know but the Tribute our Saviour paid was legally imposed according to the then Constitution?

Q. 3. Whether the Parliament had not just Cause to be offended with the Bishops Tyrannical Sermon? And

Q. 4. Whe-

Q. 4. Whether King *James I.* did not act a prudent part on this occasion, to send for the Lords and Commons to the Banqueting House, and pacified them, by Censuring the Bishop for not adding, That *the Goods and Money were Casars according to the Laws and Customs of the Country wherein they did live?* Rushworth Col. Vol. i. p. 446. Edit. 1659.

XIII. *All Antiquity is absolutely for Absolute Obedience to Princes in all Civil or Temporal things.* Sibthorp's Sermon, p. 12.

Q. 1. Whether Moderate Archbishop *Abbot's* Observation upon this Doctrine was not just, viz. That by this Divinity *the Inhabitants of London were obliged to obey, if the King should send for all their Wealth; and if his Majesty did not, the defect is not in those flattering Divines?*

Q. 2. Whether it be not for the Honour of High Church, to have it remembred that this good Archbishop was Sequestred for not Licensing that Sermon.

Q. 3. Whether the great Mr. *Selden's* Observation upon this Doctrine was not just, viz. If that Divinity was true, there was *no meum or tuum*, and no Man in *England* had any thing of his own.

XIV. Our King is an Absolute Monarch, and has the Supreme Power within this Kingdom, *that is not Limited or Restrained by Coactive Law.* Sir Geo. Mackenzy's *Jus Regium*, p. 34.

Our King derives his Authority from God alone; therefore *the Monarchy can never be Limited by the People, and consequently must be Absolute.* Ibid. p. 36.

Whatever proves Monarchy to be an Excellent Government, does by the same Reason prove *Absolute Monarchy to be the best Government.* Ibid. p. 46.

Tho' a *Mix'd Monarchy* may seem a plausible thing to *Metaphysical Spirits and Schoolmen*, yet to such as understand Government and the World it cannot but appear *impracticable*, *ibid.* p. 42.

Since Monarchy is that Government whereby a King is Supreme, the Monarch must be *presum'd neither to be oblig'd to Govern by the Advice of the Nobility, nor by the Advice of the People; for that were to confound Monarchy with Aristocracy and Democracy,* *ibid.* p. 37.

These *Limitations* are against the Nature of Monarchy, *ibid.* p. 39.

The Nobility and Commons *Assembled in Parliament have no Coercive Power*, the King is Supreme himself, and Accountable to none but God Almighty alone, *ibid.* p. 46.

Our

Our Late Reformation in *Brittain* seems to have been permitted by God, to let us see that *Mix'd Governments having Power to Reform Kings, are more unsufferable than Tyranny*, *ibid.* p. 44.

It is fit for the People that their Kings should be above Law, because the severity of the Law will not comply with that useful tho' illegal Justice which is requisite in special Cases, *ibid.* p. 47.

It cannot be denied but that a King may take any Man's Lands and Build a Garrison upon it, paying for it. Nor can it be denied, but that the King in time of War may Quarter freely, *ibid.* p. 54.

Q. 1. Whether the University of *Oxford*, who allow'd Sir George to Dedicate this Book to them, and approv'd it, did not make all those Tyrannical Principles their own?

Q. 2. Whether these and the other Doctrines of the same Nature abovementioned, be not the Doctrines which Mr. *Sacheverell* in his Affize Sermon says distinguish the Church of *England* from all others of the Reformation?

Q. 3. Whether he does not belie the Church of *England* when he says so, since they are only the Doctrines of his High Church?

Q. 4. Whether it was not dishonourable to the Learned University to suffer themselves to be impos'd upon by Sir George in matters of Fact as to the Constitution of *Scotland*, when by looking into the *Scotch* Histories and Law Books, and into the Ancient Acts of the Parliament of *Scotland*, they must needs have seen that what he says concerning the Origine of the *Scots* Government, and the Constitution and Power of their Parliament, is a downright falshood; particularly p. 68 and 69, where he says, the Kings of *Scotland* made Laws of old without any Consent, and that in their old Books of Statutes there is no mention of the Consent, either of the Nobility, People, or Parliament; and that the *Scots* had no Burgesses in Parliament till the time of King *Robert III.* all which is proved to be directly false by the very Books which Sir George quotes, viz. the Statutes of King *William*, Cap. 7, 9, 32. of *Alexander 2d*, Cap. 2, 3, 4, 15, 16. *Malcolm Canmore*, *Regiam Majestatem*, p. 1. of King *David*, *ibid.* Fol. 5. in dorso. *Robert 1st's* Parliament, Statute 1st, Cap. 34. *David 2d*, Cap. 17, 28, 29. *Robert 2.* Stat. 17. Stat. *David 2d*, 41. *Robert 2.* Cap. 3. *Regiam Majestatem*, Preface, Paragraph 10.

Q. 5. Whether this practice of Sir George be not an Eminent Instance of High Church Honesty, and whether it ought not to be a Caution to the University how they give credit to the Representations of the *Scotch* High Church-men among them?

Q. 6. Whe-

Q. 6. Whether the University by approving Sir *George's* propositions against a mix'd Monarchy, and Governing by the Advice of the Nobility and People, did not make themselves justly liable to the above-mentioned Censure of the House of Commons, against Dr. *Manwaring* and his Fellows, that like *Guy Faux* and his Companions, they were for blowing up Parliaments and Parliamentary Power.

Q. 7. Whether according to his principles, and those of *Manwaring* and *Sibthorp*, &c. the University did not make themselves liable to Damnation, for questioning and disobeying the Commands of the late King *James*, by his Mandamus's and High Commission?

Our Kings have an absolute and unlimited Sovereignty from God, but have from time to time been limited by their own Bounty. *Watson's* discourse of Monarchy, p. 197.

Magna Charta is the Voluntary free Grant and Commission of the King, without any Vote, Suffrage or Authority of the People. Dr. *Bradys* Introduction to History, p. 167.

XV. Tyranny is rather to be wish'd for, than either Democracy or Aristocracy. *Watson's* Discourse of Monarchy, p. 42. 45.

Common sense will tell us, that *submission to the Worst of Princes, is much more the Interest of the Subject than Rebellion*; so that how much harm soever a Tyrannical Prince may bring upon a Commonwealth, he does it more good, though it were only by being a Bar against the miseries of War and Confusion. *Parker's* Religion and Loyalty, part 1. p. 81.

That same Author quarrels with *Barclay* and *Grotius*, for allowing Resistance to Princes in any Case, as being an Inlet to the subversion of all Government. *ibid* p. 118.

Q. Whether the Instance of the late happy Revolution, be not a demonstrable proof that *Parker* was out of his senses, to say that submission was more our Interest than what High Church calls Rebellion; since had we not resisted we must have long ere this been as much Dragoon'd out of our Religion and Liberty, as our Ancestors were in Queen *Mary's* days, or as the *French* are in our own.

XVI. Our Kings have a Right over us by Conquest, That the Kings power is superiour to all others, on the account of an absolute Conquest of *England* made by King *William I.* whereby he acquired to himself and his Successors an Absolute Dominion over all Mens Persons, and Estates, which was not to be questioned or limited, any further than he should think good, is maintain'd by Dr. *Brady*, Dr. *Johnston*,
Dr.

Dr. Fern, Mr. Dudley Diggs and others, who wrote against the long Parliament, and confuted by Mr. Tyrrel in his Introduction, to Vol. 2d of his History, p. xxxi.

If the Original Contract, so much of late days spoken of, was in the time of the *Brittains*, it was subdued to the *Romans*; if by the *Saxons*, it was subdued to the *Danes*; and if by the *Danes*, it was overcome by the *Normans*; for as every Conquest altered all possession and property, so it altered the Laws and Customs of the Kingdom; and over-rul'd all former Original Contracts, if ever any such has been; and the Successors of the Conqueror carry down with them as much Right and Authority as the Conqueror first had himself. The Exorbitant Grants of *William* 3d. p. 19. 20.

Q. 1. Whether any thing less than High Church assurance, could have born out any Man in dedicating this Libel, call'd Exorbitant Grants to Her Majesty, since it stricken at the Title and Right by which Her Majesty holds her Crown?

Q. 2. Whether the Author did not rather deserve Punishment than Reward for his Libel?

Q. 3. Whether those who set up a Title to the Crown by Conquest, don't prompt the People to rid themselves of the Conquerors, and to recover their Liberty as soon as they can, and by consequence, open a source of perpetual Rebellion?

Q. 4. What may be suppos'd to be the Reason, why the late House of Commons did not order the Libeller to be prosecuted, and the Libel to be burnt by the Hand of the Common Hangman.

XVII. That it is, *Damnable and Unlawful* in any Case to resist the Prince, or those having his Commission by force of Arms; **Tho' he would destroy or sell the Kingdom to a Foreign Power.**

To resist the King, **By Authority of Parliament**, is Damnation by the Law of God. *Parker of Religion and Loyalty*, p. 102.

The Apostles Command of Subjection to Higher Powers, and not to resist them, has no Restriction, no Reservation, and is against all manner of Resistance, *ibid*, p. 80. 92.

It is not lawful to resist the Prince, though he sets himself to destroy the Commonwealth, or would sell the Kingdom to Foreign Power, *ibid* p. 118, 119. &c.

If the King be a **Wicked Tyrant, or Idolater, or however else, the Licentiousness of an Enrag'd Rabble may render him**; the subordinate, Magistrates Nobility or People, may not restrain or remove him, *Watson's Discourse of Monarchy*, p. 198.

It

It is not lawful for Subjects to rise in Arms against their Kings on any pretext whatever, *no not to defend their Liberty nor Religion.* Sir George Mackenzy, *Jus Regium* p. 86.

Nor can I see how all such as declare War, are not to be concluded Guilty of desiring to Murther the King, *ibid* p. 89.

The University of Oxford affirm'd in the Name of the Holy Trinity, That we ought not to defend our Lives and Estates, our Religion or our Laws, against Illegal and Arbitrary Power; and that our Obedience must be clear, absolute and without Exception of any Persons or States, or order of Men, though a King should subvert the Government, destroy our Constitution, or become a Tyrant. *London Gazette* July 26th, 1683.

Pareus's Works were ordered to be burnt in both Universities, who in a Convocation Condemn'd his Maxims, as false, seditious, impious, and destructive of all Civil Government; and declared that according to Scripture, it was not lawful for Subjects to resist Sovereigns by force of Arms, or to make War against them offensive or defensive, for the Cause of Religion or any other pretence whatsoever; and ordered, that whoever took any degrees in any Faculty, should take an Oath, that he did in his Heart condemn the said Doctrine of *Pareus*. Heylins *Life of Laud*, p 95.

Archbp. *Laud* himself, maintain'd the same Doctrine. Conference with *Fisher*, p. 205. and the High Church Drs. of *Aberdeen* did the like in their Duplies, p. 25, 29, &c.

It is needless to trouble the Reader with any more quotations on this Head. It was not only the Doctrine of the Pulpit and Bench in the Reign of King *Charles II.* and King *James II.* but was established into a Law; so that all Clergymen Lords Lieutenants, Magistrates of Towns, Common Councilmen, Officers of Corporations, and Military Men were sworn to it, That it was unlawful upon any pretence whatever, to take up Arms against the King, or those that were Commissioned by him, as appears by the 13th *Car. 2d. Ch. 1.* & 14. *Car. 2d. Ch. 13, 14.*

Q. 1. If according to this Doctrine, all our Parliaments and People, who concurr'd in the Revolution, and swore fealty to King *William* and Queen *Mary*, or our Protestant Sovereign Queen *Anne*, have not incur'd the Guilt of damnation?

Q. 2. Whether the High Churchmen who think according to these principles, that Her Majesty must be damn'd without Repentance, for concurring with those that took Arms in defence of our Laws and Religion against her Father, who by wicked Councillors, and those passive obedience Doctors was emboldened to attempt the Subversion of both, can ever be good Subjects to Her Majesty?

Q. 3. Whether if those High Churchmen, should prevail and bring in the *St. Germans* pretender, Her Majesty, and the chief of all our Peers, Nobility, Gentry and Clergy, who have concurr'd with, and approv'd the late happy Revolution, must not expect Col. *Sidneys* fate, who was Condemn'd and Executed, for maintaining the principles of the Revolution, viz. *That the People of England, have a Right to set aside their Prince, in case it appear to them, that he hath broken the Trust they laid upon him, p. 12. of his Tryal, and for asserting with Bracton, that the King hath three superiours, viz. Deum, Legem & Parliamentum; 'That* " is, the Power Originally in the People of *England*, is delegated un-
 " to the Parliament: He is subject unto the Law of God as a King,
 " and as he is a Man to the People that makes him a King. In as much
 " as he is a King, the Law sets a measure unto the subjection, and the
 " Parliament Judges of the particular Cases thereupon arising, &c.
 " *ibid p. 23.*

Q. 4. Whether since according to Sir *George Mackenzies* Doctrine, approv'd by the University of *Oxford*, Her Majesty and the Nation are all to be accounted Regicides, Her Majesty had not very good Reason to advise the Gentlemen of that University to send up moderate Representatives, next Session of Parliament?

Q. 5. Whether according to the *Talion* Law, that University ought not to be oblig'd to condemn those Doctrins of Slavery and Oppression, as inconsistent with the End of Government appointed by the Word of God, Inconsistent with the ancient *English* Constitution, and as subversive of Her Majesty's Title to the Crown?

Q. 6. Whether by the same Law, all such as take degrees in any faculty in either of the Universities, ought not to take an Oath, that in their Hearts they condemn those Slavish Doctrines, as having been the Ruine of King *Charles I.* and King *James II.* made *Charles the II* uneasy on his Throne, and endanger'd the Ruine of our Liberty and Religion, had not Her Majesty and her Sister of Glorious Memory come seasonably in to their Rescue?

Q. 7. Whether it be consistent with Her Majesty's safety, and that of our Religion and Liberty, as settled upon the Revolution foot, to suffer Men tainted with such pestilent principles, as must needs make them look upon Her Majesty to be a damn'd Usurper and Rebel; and all the Parliaments we have had since the Revolution, to be in the same condition; to have the Charge of Educating our Youth in either of the Universities, where they poyson them with the abovementioned principles, that are so destructive to all humane Society?

Q. 8. Whe-

Q. 8. Whether instead of an Occasional Bill to keep such Men out of publick Employments as are known to be firm to the Interest of the Revolution, and who own Her Majesty's Title to be good and just according to Law, without any mental reserve, there ought not to be a Bill promoted to keep out of all publick posts, such as are only occasional Subjects, who own Her Majesty to be only Queen *de facto*, that is to say, so long as they dare not do otherwise; and by consequence, if they be true to their own principles, must in their Hearts be for bringing over the *St. Germans* pretender, whom they reckon to be their King *de jure*?

CHAP. IV.

The Principles of the High Church, concerning the Magistrates Power in Matters of Religion.

IT is absolutely necessary to the Peace and Government of the World, that the supreme Magistrate of every Commonwealth should be Vested with a Power to Govern and Conduct the Consciences of Subjects in Affairs of Religion, *Parker's Eccle. Polity*, 1st Edit. p. 10.

Unless Princes have Power to bind their Subjects to that Religion they apprehend most Advantageous to publick Peace and Tranquility, they are no better than Statues and Images of Authority, and want that part of their Power which is most necessary to a Right discharge of their Government, *ibid* p. 12.

If we would speak properly, the Commands of Authority perfectly determine and Evacuate all doubtfulness and Irresolution of Conscience, *ibid* p. 287.

To Act against the Inclinations of our own doubts and scruples is so far from being Criminal, that 'tis an Eminent Instance of Vertue, and implies in it, besides its subserviency to the Welfare of Mankind, the Great Duty of Modesty, Peaceableness and Humility, *ibid* p. 303.

Private Men are not properly, *sui juris*, they have no Power over their Actions, they are not to be directed by their own Judgments, or determin'd by their own Wills, but by the Commands and determinations of the publick Conscience; and if there be any Sin in the Command, he that Impos'd it shall Answer for it, and not I whose duty it is to obey. The Commands of Authority will warrant my Obedience,

my Obedience, will hallow or at least Excuse my Action, and so secure me from Sin, if not from Error; in all doubtful and disputable Cases, it is better to err with Authority, than to be in the Right against it. The Commands of Governours in all such Matters, are the supreme Rule of Conscience, *ibid* p. 308 & 309.

The Government of Religion, is so clearly unseparable from the supreme power in every Commonwealth, that it loses its supremacy and its usefulness, unless it be **Universal and Unlimited**, *Parkers Eccl. Polity*, p. 35.

The Civil Magistrate may determine New Instances of Vertue, much more New Circumstances of Worship, as he may enjoin any thing in Morality, that contradicts not the Ends of Morality, so he may in Religious Worship, if he oppose not its design. *He may Command anything in the Worship of God, that does not tend to debauch Mens practises, or their Conceptions of the Deity*, *ibid* p. 66.

External Worship is no part of Religion, It is and must be left undetermin'd; by the Law of God, under the Christian dispensation, he has left the disposal of Outward Worship, to the power and discretion of the Church, *ibid* p. 88.

Whatsoever our Superiours impose upon us, whether in Matters of Religious Worship, or any other duties of Morality, it neither is nor can be any Entrenchment upon our Christian Liberty, provided it be not impos'd with an Opinion of the Antecedent Necessity of the thing it self, *ibid* p. 97.

CHAP. V.

The Principles of the High Church relating to Toleration or Liberty of Conscience.

Liberty of Conscience is inconsistent with the first and fundamental Law of Government. *Parker Eccl. Polity*, Preface p. 46, 47.

If Princes would but consider how liable Mankind are to abuse themselves with Serious and Conscientious Villanies, they would quickly see it to be absolutely necessary to the Peace and Happiness of their Kingdoms, to set up a more severe Government over Mens Consciences and Religious perswasions, than over their Vices and Immoralities; *For of all Villains the Well-meaning Zealot is the most dangerous—*

Indul.

Indulgence and Toleration is the most absolute sort of Anarchy, and Princes may with less hazard give Liberty to Mens Vices and Debaucheries than to their Consciences. Ibid. p. 52, 53, 54, 55.

In the Preface to the 2d Part of his *Religion and Loyalty*, He says, that the Consequences of *Pretended Moderation*, or as we phrase it *Comprehension*, are fatal and bloody. It indeed unites all Parties, but then it is like a *Whirlpool into one common Gulph of Ruin and Confusion*, and the design of his whole Book is to Preach up the Necessity of Penal Laws in the State.

Those who are subject to Superior Powers ought to submit to their Judgment, tho' it be contrary to their own doubting and scrupulous Conscience. *Thorndike's Weights and Measures*, p. 130.

The Obedience which People give to their Sovereign is attended with a Blessing, tho' what they Command about Circumstances in Religion, be manifestly against the Law of God. *Hickeringil Greg. Father Greybeard*, p. 322.

In Matters Ecclesiastical, Princes alone, without the Advice of any of the Clergy, may Lawfully make what Canons they please, and compel their Clergy to embrace them. *Weem's de Primatu Regis*, p. 59.

It is in the Power of Sovereigns, whether Monarchical, Aristocratical or Democratical, to appoint for the Government of the Church in their Dominions, such Officers and Spiritual Courts, as they find most meet and agreeable to their Temporal Estates, *ibid.* p. 124.

Q. 1. Whether according to those Principles, a Man may not, without any crime, be a Papist in *Rome*, and a Mahometan in *Turky*?

Q. 2. Whether these Principles about Toleration may not serve to give some Light into the designs of some of those who were so very Zealous for promoting the Occasional Bill?

Q. 3. Whether these Principles ought not to make us cease to wonder, that so many of the High Church are such Enemies to the Societies of Reformation of Manners, and to Dissenters at the same time, since its plain, that according to *Parker's Proposition*, Bawdy-houses are more tolerable than Conventicles?

Q. 4. Whether the practice of High Church does not contradict her Principles? And whether those Principles be not inconsistent with one another, or as changeable as the Moon, since a Power is here given to Sovereigns to make what Courts and Canons they please, and compel their Clergy to obey them; and yet Toleration is arraign'd as a Bloody Anarchy, a Whirlpool of Ruine and Confusion, and our present

sent High Church cannot forbear to Libel Her Majesty and her Government, because of her enjoying and practising Moderation?

Q. 5. Whether Men of these Principles can have any Religion at all?

Q. 6. Whether those who are so violent for the Occasional Bill now, don't act from the same Principles, and to the same end, viz. from Superstitious and Tyrannical Principles in Matters of Religion and Government, and in order to secure the Great blessing of a Frenchified Popish Successor, as the Anti-Excluders did from 1680 to 1684. and particularly the Honest Moderate *Cornish* Addressers, who charg'd the Whiggs of those days with sublimated Sedition, and promis'd the Government, that they would be ready to **make good in Red**, what they promis'd in Black against the Whiggs?

Q. 7. If none of the Occasional Bill-men have the like kindness in view to the pretended Son, that their predecessors had for the supposed Father, when in their Addresses from *Rippon, Sarum, Dartmouth, Harness, Norwich*, and West Division of *Surry*, *They thank'd the King for not suffering the Laws against Dissenters to be Repeal'd, prayed they might be put in Execution, and affirm'd Dissenters to be as dangerous as Papists?*

Q. 8. Whether *Sucheverell*, in his Assize Sermon, be not of the same mind, when he inveighs so bitterly against a few Dissenting Schools, while he takes no notice of 49 or 50 *English, Irish and Scotch* Monasteries and Nunneries abroad, besides what Seminaries they have at home, whose Principles lead them to endeavour the Subversion both of Church and State?

Q. 9. Whether that same Author be not for such Bloody Assizes again as *Jefferies* had in the West, since he is so very free to **Hang and Damn** all the Occasional Conformists? p. 32.

Q. 10. If that Bloody Priest had Power answerable to his VVill, whether Her Majesty, who has recommended Union and Moderation so frequently from the Throne, and the House of Lords who to his great Mortification have withstood the Occasional Bill, could expect any fairer quarter from him?

Q. 11. VVhether it be for the Honour of the University that their Vice Chancellor should have Licensed that Sermon? or for the Honour of the Grand Jury that they should have desir'd it to be Printed?

C H A P. VI.

Concerning the Succession.

THe Sovereign comes to be so by a fundamental Hereditary Right of Succession, which no Religion, no Law, no Fault or Forfeiture can alter or diminish. Vice-Chanc. Camb. Speech to the King, Sep. 18. 1681. Gaz. Numb. 1653.

It is *Lex Legum*, or great standing Law of this Inheritable Kingdom, that nothing is to be consented to in Parliament which tends to the disinherison of the Crown; This is the Great Rule by which all Acts of Parliament are to be fram'd; and if any of them transgress it, they are as Null and Void from the beginning, as Marriage with a Person who hath a Natural Impediment or Imperfection. *Jovian* in his Preface.

No difference in Religion, nor no Law nor Act of Parliament made, or to be made, can alter or divert the Right of Succession and Lineal descent of the Crown to the nearest and Lawful Heirs——nor can stop and hinder them in the full, free and actual Administration of the Government, according to the Laws of the Kingdom. Act of Parliament in Scotland 1681. in favour of the then Duke of York's Succession.

People had no more Right to chuse Kings than to chuse their Fathers. *Watson's Discourse of Monarchy*, p. 15.

Sir Geo. Mackenzy, in his *Right of the Succession defended*, and approved by the University of Oxon, bound up with his *Jus Regium*, maintains this Proposition, That neither the People nor Parliament can Exclude the Lineal Successor, or Raise to the Throne any other of the same Royal Line. And P. 181. he alledges that the 13 of Eliz. C. 2. which made it High Treason to affirm that the Parliament of Eng^{land} has not full Power to Bind and Govern the Crown in point of Succession and Descent, that such a Person during the Queen's Life should be Guilty of High Treason, and after her Life of a Premunire, was but a Temporal Act. Dr. Brady in his Introduction to the old English History, p. 399, &c. says much the same; and that this Act could take no effect after the Queen's Death; that it was only levell'd against the opinion, that the Queen of Scots had the better Title during Queen Elizabeth's Life, and to preserve her Memory from being defam'd after her Death.

Q. 1. If those High Church Principles about the Succession, be not absolutely inconsistent with the several Acts of Parliament for Settling the Succession in the Hanover Protestant Line?

Q. 2. If

Q. 2. If those Laws might not possibly have been Repeal'd, could High Church have got the Occasional Bill pass'd, and by consequence the Commissions of Peace, the Lieutenancy, the Magistracy of Corporations, and all the Sherifalties of the Kingdom into their own Hands?

Q. 3. Whether had that been the Case, they might not have return'd what House of Commons they had pleas'd?

Q. 4. Whether it was not in prospect of this that the Papists, Jacobites and Nonjurants, did all appear so zealous for the Occasional Bill?

Q. 5. Whether this is not at the bottom of their Zeal, for having the Tackers and others of that Stamp chosen again?

Q. 6. Whether the Author of the *Exorbitant Grants* did not express the sense of the Party in the Matter of the Succession, p. 16, 17, 18. where he gives an Account of *Setting aside the Act of Entail or Settlement of the Crown*, made in the 1st of Hen. 4. *because he had no other Title to the Crown but from the People, and therefore could convey no more than what he had in himself*; and that we may be sure not to mistake him, he tells us, that King Henry 6th was to enjoy the Crown during his Natural Life, and that the Duke of York, who they said was the Lawful Heir, should succeed him. And p. 27. he applies the Case in plain terms to Her Majesty, and pretended Prince of Wales, and says, That future Ages will not only applaud the Queen, but render it the most glorious Action of her Life to take the Government upon her, to keep the Monarchy entire, to keep the Royal Authority and Power in her own Blood and Family, and to keep Strangers out of the English Throne?

Q. 7. Whether we have not good ground to Suspect that the Author spoke the mind of the High Church party, since the Villainous Libel was never call'd in question, tho' frequently taken notice of by the *Observer* and others; and tho' the Author in the Conclusion submits it to the House of Commons then Sitting?



F I N I S.